France Will Seize Rhineland If Brussels Conference Fails

Nation Tired of Waiting for Germany to Pay for Devastation, Says Editor, as He Cites Costs Up to Date

Editor in Chief of "Le Matin"

PARIS, November 11.

IT IS to be most sincerely hoped that the coming Brussels conference, which will take place at the beginning of December, will succeed, for it is most certainly the last international attempt to which France will lend herself for settling the question of the reparations amicably. In the event of its not meeting with success, France would then take back her freedom of action and would enforce payment to her by her own means.

France cannot wait any longer.

Up to November she has paid 96,000,000,000 francs and, on January 1, she will have paid 100,000,000,000 francs (about $7,000,000,000 at the present rate of exchange) for the pensions and for the restoration of the devastated districts of the north of France. According to the treaty of peace, it is Germany who should have paid these $7,000,000,000, for it is Germany that is the voluntary cause of the war and it is Germany who is the voluntary cause of the devastations. But Germany has paid nothing at all.

France, therefore, has borrowed these $7,000,000,000 from her own people; but France cannot borrow money indefinitely. She has to pay an interest of 6 per cent on the borrowed money, and half of the expenses of the budget have actually to meet the service of the debt.

Tax Rate Has Increased By Great Bounds Since 1913

Notwithstanding what may be thought abroad, the fiscal effort, since ten years, has been immense. In 1913 the total of the taxes paid by France was 5,000,000,000 francs; to-day it is 20,000,000,000; that is to say, it has quadrupled. In order to be able to judge of this effort, it must be remembered that the war has cost France 1,500,000 lives, that France has at the present moment 1,200,000 disabled men, incapable of working to the full of their capacity, and that the number of healthy men between nineteen to sixty years has decreased from 10,402,000 in 1913 to 8,000,000 in 1922. From this fact the burden of the taxes has considerably increased per head of inhabitant; in 1913, it was 460 francs per head of inhabitant, and in 1922 it is 2,478 francs.

France considers that she cannot do more. She notes that of the 7,000,000,000 gold marks actually paid down by Germany in money or in kind not a cent has been given to her for reparations. So she is determined, once for all, to put a stop to the present state of things and to act.

What will she do if the Brussels conference fails?

She will certainly not mobilize an army; she will not invade Germany; she will perhaps not even enter the Ruhr; but she will seize the resources which she has at hand on the left bank of the Rhine.

France Has Plans Made For Rhineland Occupation

At present the inhabitants of the Rhineland continue to pay down their taxes into the bottomless coffer of the Reich; why should they not pay them to France? (When, in 1871, the Germans occupied forty-five French departments, these forty-five departments paid their taxes to Germany.) At present, the Rhineland railroads, the forests of the Rhineland, the mines of the Rhineland, are being exploited by the state of Prussia; why should they not be exploited by France?

It has been figured that if France were to collect the taxes in the Rhineland, if she were to exploit the railroads, the mines, the forests of the Rhineland, she would easily collect 1,000,000,000 gold marks, which is more than 3,500,000,000 of the present French money. Now, a net annual revenue of $250,000,000 represents a capital of at least $5,000,000,000. The revenues of the left bank of the Rhine would therefore allow France to make a loan of 70,000,000,000 francs at the present rate of exchange. The two-thirds of the sums which are at present being paid out by France would then be reimbursed—and the annual interest of the French debt would thus be lightened by two-thirds.

It is possible that such a calculation is rather optimistic; but even if the figures were reduced by one-half it would still represent $2,000,000,000 which France would receive. To-day, I repeat it, after three years of peace, of negotiations, of discussions, she has received nothing at all.

A Latin proverb says: "Primum vivere, deinde philosophere." France wishes to live. If the Brussels conference fails to give her the means of doing so, she will find them without caring about the appreciations of philosophers.

Versailles Treaty Bombarded With Hard Words by Frenchmen

PARIS, Nov. 1.

A UNIQUE campaign against the Versailles Treaty, which document France accepted from Georges Clemenceau, the old war premier, as sort of an incorrigible "stepchild," is now in full swing here. Damnation of the pact that the "Tiger" will go to the United States in November to defend is inspired by the legitimate fear in internal political circles that the eighty-one-years-old statesman is preparing to throw his influence at least into the fray and may possibly lend himself to a subtle campaign in America to bolster up the cause of the Democratic treaty defenders.

The treaty has few champions in France. However, as the outcome of the wave of denunciation now going on can neither mean amendment of the document or its replacement by another, more acceptable to France, the campaign must bear the stamp of an effort to counteract, in advance, what Clemenceau is going to say to Americans.

"Le Matin," the powerful Paris newspaper is taking the lead to show in a unique manner that France's fighters feel that France won the war but lost the peace. The paper has interviewed hundreds of men who distinguished themselves in the late war. To have been decorated for bravery or war service is the only qualification under which Frenchmen are allowed to denounce the Versailles Treaty in the "Matin." These denunciations are not only interesting but sum up forcefully and briefly what the French fighters feel. Some opinions follow:

"A treaty which obliges France to have, three years after the armistice, 800,000 men under arms and a crime against the French nation."

"Happily, in 1914, one could not foresee the future."

"A good weapon of which England holds the handle and France feels the point."

"A poor infant for so many fathers."

"No good, because it contains the germ of new wars."

"Not much, but something, it must be kept to win the peace."

"We must not forget that it gave us Alsace-Lorraine, but that means little unless we can repair our ruins."

"Partibus factis, sic locutus est leo. Unhappily, in this case it is the English lion itself that is divided."

"The last act of the tragedy—the treaty—is so bad that one is permitted to ask if it isn't necessary to play the other acts again."

"The work of several politicians, none of whom had any genius for organization."

"It remains precious testimony of French moderation."

"A simple scrap of paper which the enemy is tempted to tear up on the morrow of signature, believing in advance that a coalition, fatigued by war, cannot but disagree in peace."

"A formidable interrogation point which only the future can answer."

"A treaty of reprisal and affairs unchanged, but more hypocritical."

"Hell paved with good intentions."

"More combatants and less politicians would have elaborated its clauses."

"A structure on sand. No peace thrives in an atmosphere of hate. Until there is a victor and vanquished wars are inevitable."

"Constructed by bad architects."

"The supreme disillusion for those who shed their blood."

"We merit better and will accept nothing less."

"The eternal error of incapable French diplomacy.

"The Treaty of Versailles is not that which we might have wished it to be: the last treaty of the last war."

"The Versailles Treaty has substituted a provisional and localized war for a state of general and permanent war. It contains the germ of all future wars in the world."

"A verbal jungle."

"Monsieur Woodrow Wilson is a great democrat."

"The proof that events grow beyond men, or at least the viellards who conduct the people."

"An imbecilic masterpiece composed by idiotic jurists and maladroit Utopians."

"A masterpiece of Wilsonian idealism."

"A venomous flower sprouted through the decomposed débris of thousands of dead and which, if we do not take care, will poison our children."

"Being inapplicable, this treaty is nothing more than a scrap of paper."

"The labor of the aged, when the young of the Old World hoped for a work as courageous, confident and idealistic as was their sacrifice."

"A perpetual hope, but what will come of it?"

"A wound dressing that slipped."

"The treaty has the value of those who applied it."

The New Dance

Not everybody is absorbed with politics, and one should not be too severe toward the young people who are more interested in dancing than in the Near East question or in the mem rs of William II. On account of these, says a writer in "La Victoire," we must consi'er a grave communication of Professor Robert, the introducer in Paris of the Argentine tango and foxtrot.

This time the dances that were in vogue last winter are, even like King "Tino," dethroned. And it is not the "shimmy" that will succeed to the favor once given to the tango and foxtrot, but the Fox-Blues.

The new dance launched last summer at Deauville, at Biarritz and at San Sebastian will certainly win a great success at Paris, where the women frequenters of the dancing resorts will want to repeat the steps that met with the approval of Alfonso XIII.

Henceforth the Fox-Blues, which also comes from America, offers this peculiarity, that its steps are not "slid," but walked.

Labor Unionism in Japan Acclaimed As Democracy in Most Youthful Form

Nippon Federation Based on American Lines and Pledged to Avoid Violence

By Adachi Kinnosuke

American correspondent of the Tokio Jiji

THE Japan Federation of Labor held its eleventh aniversary convention in the great city of Osaka last month.

The Yuaikai, or Friendly Society for Workingmen, modeled after the historic pattern of the British organization, came into being in Tokio in 1912, although it did not assume the sonorous name of the Japan Federation of Labor until it held its eighth anniversary convention in 1919. To those who know the social constitution of the islanders across the Pacific the news that a labor union was born in Japan is sensational. That it went on breathing for eleven years is a miracle to those who know the gentle and leisurely days of the Elder Nippon. And, what is more, it has been doing much more than breathing. It has been clamoring ever since it was born and every day of its existence, clamoring against the police, against the municipal authorities, against the labor policy of the central government, and most thunderously of all against the "million crimes of heartless capital."

The labor union in Japan is a humble, if noisy, democracy within an oligarchy. The Japan Federation of Labor, like the American Federation of Labor, which it copies in its major lines, is based on "that principle of alliance upon which the union of American states proceeded." In a democratic nation like the United States, with its highly developed and complicated industrial and commercial life, labor unions prove often to be wreckers of democracy. They order their members to stop working. To insure victory it is often necessary that power—vast and autocratic power over the very life of a community—be put into the hands of a few labor leaders. That, of course, is oligarchy, and the union becomes a mighty wrecker of democracy, as Viscount Bryce points out in his "Modern Democracy."

Forerunner of Democracy Is Traced in Labor Union

But within an oligarchy—like that of Japan, for example—the labor union works out entirely differently. It serves as the forerunner of democracy by placing before the people an example of democracy in its youngest form.

And that is precisely the story of the Japan Federation of Labor and other similar bodies and organizations in Japan. For, after all, the biggest harvest of the labor union in Japan is not its victory in wage increases and in shortening the hours of labor. Its biggest achievement is in awakening the consciousness of power among the masses. Curiously enough, it is not the consciousness of a political power that the labor unions awakened in the masses. Indeed, in the tremendous turmoil in 1919 and the early days of 1920 over universal suffrage, when the labor elements fought with the fire and zeal of ancient prophets, they came to see that they could do nothing, they could get nothing, through politics. What they awoke in the masses was the realization of their economic power. They discovered for themselves and for the masses a weapon with which they could dictate to the politicians. They found that this economic weapon reached up and touched the very masters of the oligarchy upon their age-hallowed dais.

For example, there was the now historic tramcar strike in Tokio in February, 1920. The Communications Labor Union of Tokio was formed in those stormy days in the latter half of 1919, the gold star year in the story of labor in Japan. This was the first year in which sabtage was introduced into the industrial history of Japan. That was the year in which the hitherto meak and humble workmen of the government arsenal at Osaka dared to give the ougsut government a taste of thoroughly Occidental "ca' canny." The workmen met with almost instant success. That was the year of the great strike at the Muroran steel foundry in the north of Japan for an eight-hour day and a wage increase, and in the south of Japan, in Kyushu, of the formation of a fighting labor under the gentle name of Royu-kai (Labor Friendship Society). In September of that year the biggest strike known to Japan up to that time took place, the walk-out of 16,549 workmen at the great Kawasaki Dockyard at Kobe.

Just about the time when the men of Osaka arsenal were organizing a union under the name of Kojyo-kai, some 5,000 employees of the Electric Bureau of the Tokio Municipality formed a labor union. They took a large proportion of th tramcar men into the organization, which was christened the Communications Labor Union. Now the tram workers did not like a number of things in connection with their jobs. About the middle of February, 1920, about 400 of them found themselves off duty. They went down in a body to the Municipal Electric Bureau. They asked to see the officials, but a number of policemen, who did not see any reason why the workmen should be laying siege to the office of the Municipal Electric Bureau. And they said so with fists and rattling sabres. In the encountor all three parties, the police, the bureau biulding and the tramcar men came out more or loss damaged.

Strikers Joined Parades For Universal Suffrage

That was just the time when the country was burning up with the first fever of the universal suffrage epidemic. An th tramcar men found it pleasanter to parade and yell with the suffrage advocates in Uyeno and Shiba parks in Tokio than to stick to their jobs. So they went on strike. On February 22 there were 40,000 people gathered in the Shiba Park in a monster mass meeting demanding a voice in the affairs of the empire. The tramcar men joined with them with enthusiasm—so much enthusiasm that they included universal suffrage in the list of their demands. That, incidentally, was the first time that a labor strike in Japan took on a definite political coloring.

The tramcar men did not win out that time. Stopping traffic of the capital city wos a serious matter; it called for heroic measures. Under police pressure the strikers went back to work. It was then that ancient City of Tokio saw what it had never before seen in al its many century existence. This time it was not satotage. It was the Japanese edition of a labor strike under conditions in which no strike was possible; of a strike on which one, not even the Tokio police, could put the name of a strike.

Hundreds of tram cars went over the tracks on Tokyo streets. And most of them moved much faster than they had been wont to do. They rushed by crowded corner after corner, with never a thought or hint of stopping. And they stopped miles from where anybody wished to stop. There were other cars, hundreds of them, also which behaved entirely differently. These cars stopped all along, not only on street corners, but often in the middle of a block and more than once. These moved at the rate of some two miles an hour. The streets became choked with crippled cars. The number of hot boxes which developed, the number of broken brakes, fenders, machinery parts seemed the work of demons.

Here then was a refinement in passive insurrection worthy of a great cause—of a much nobler cause oven than the mere improvement in the life conditions of a working class. It was an insurrection infinitely harded to meet than a mutiny in an armp camp. After three days of it, some six hundred men, thought to be the ringleaders of this matchless form of cabotage, were discharged. Did it improve traffic conditions? It did not. It made them worse by the absence of six hundred pairs of hands. For the men who remained on the job stood by their war tactics with the same constancy as the snow which hugs the top of Mount Fuji.

Conditions like that cannot continue forever—not even with the long-suffering patience of a Japanese crowd. The solution came. t came in the shortening of working hours, in the rise of wage scale, and in the grant of many other demands of the tram car men. That gave the men a sense of power that was new.

This took place at the time when the whole country was standing face to face with the realization that the only salvation for Japan was to change from an agricultural into an industrial state. And that made the coming of the workingmen into their own still more significant. This new found sense of power mounted to their heads like young wine. But then something else came along and saved them in spite of themselves.

Depression Curts Victory Gained By Labor in Japan

Within a brief month or two after the tram car men won their fight came the first hint of the post-war depression. Within less than half a year from that time the prosperity bubble was pricked. Soon the great industrial plants, more especially the iron works and shipbuilding yards, which had prospered on the impatient war-time needs, were at their wits end to keep their doors open. Strikes among their men? It would have been a heavenly music in their ears. For in Japan, the ancient industrial tradition makes the matter of discharge allowances a very serious consideration. All this meant that Japanese labor had lost its one effective weapon almost as quickly as it had found it. All through the latter half of 1920, 1921 and up until the present time the Japanese labor unions have been treading through the valley of the shadow of despair. One important thing about this journey is that they did not go backward. Quite the contrary. They made a tremendous headway through the dark days.

On April 2 the Kansai General League of Labor Unions (by far the most important labor body of Central Japan, including such important industrial cities as Kobe, Osaka and Kioto), held a mass meeting at Osaka; and at that meeting the movement for the establishment of one big national labor union was launched. The Kansai body was so strong it went so far as to declare that it was quite willing to disband in order to make the proposed national labor union a reality. At the May Day gatherings of the labor organizations of northeastern Japan at Tokio, which followed the Osaka meeting of the Kansai body, the workingmen of the northeast district expressed the same desire. The ways and means committee for the formation of the national union, under the name of Nippon General Confederation of Labor Unions, met in June, 1922. By September 10, when the representatives of the fifty-eight labor organizations gathered together at Matsumoto-tei, in Kanda, Tokio, the proposition had taken definite shape. Back of the men who had gathered there stood some 200,000 workingmen of Japan. It was an historic event. And on the evening of September 10, at Matsumoto-tei, the preliminary steps of the launching of the one great national union were gone smoothly through. The result of the Matsumoto-tei Conference was to be reported to the national mass meeting which was to meet at Osaka on September 30, one day before the eleventh anniversary convention of the Japan Federation of Labor was to gather in the same city. The sky was not entirely cloudless; still, most of the labor leaders felt that so far as the final success of the big union was concerned it was a fairly safe winging into the sunlit blue.

The Osaka meeting came as scheduled—on September 30. But the expected did not come to pass. The mass meeting broke up in a blind frenzy of civil war; the police had to disperse it. But something quite as significant as the establishment of the one big union came to the surface in the stormy session—something which made oligarchical Japan rub its eyes in wonder. The whole big union plan was wrecked over precisely the same question which fathered the Civil War in America—that of state rights—or, as the Osaka labor debaters called it, the invasion of the complete autonomy of local unions.

Workmen Decry Violence In Fighting for Cause

At the third session of the eleventh anniversary convention of the Japan Federation of Labor, which was held following the stormy, unsuccessful inauguration mass meeting of the General Conference of Labor Unions of Japan, there came to pass an incident which throws a picturesque and important light on the character and workings of the Japanese labor unions. J. Okumura, of the Kioto union, introduced a resolution calling on the Japanese Federation of Labor to impeach the Kioto prefectural authorities. It was over the official attitude on the employment of violence in connection with the labor dispute at the Sawada Alloy Works of Kioto. This resolution passed amid thunderous acclamation. Then arose the question of establishing a "defense organization" to meet just such a case as that of the Sawada incident. Mr. Sakaguchi, of the Kofu union, rose to his feet. The gist of his speech was that it is not honorable to answer violence with violence. He was opposed to the establishment of a standing fighting organization.

That seemed a rather unpopular note to strike while the echoes of the indignant denunciation over the Sawada outrage were still filling the ears of the convention. It turned out to be nothing of the sort, however. The Osaka delegation spoke up. It said something which sounded extraordinary, coming as it did from the lips of the men who worked with their hands and feet. It said that physical violence is not necessary in a fight of ideas. More astounding still, the resolution was lost.

So it is not altogether a fight for food and shelter that the workingmen of Japan are waging. It is for the war of ideas that they have enlisted.

Bishop's Rebuke to Marlborough Causes Clash Over Divorce Views

Can a Man Who Is Lawfully Married Be Treated as a Pariah by the Church Because of His Marriage? Asks Duke

LONDON, November 8.

NOT since the good old days when kings had some trouble in keeping bishops in order and bishops could send kings walking barefoot through Canterbury has there been such a clash between Church and State in this country. One of the lords temporal of England has been excommunicated by one of his fellow peers, a lord spiritual. That, at least, is as near as one can define the quarrel between Bishop Burge of Oxford and the Duke of Marlborough, in which the clergy and laity of England have hastened to take a hand.

The United States has an interest in this quarrel, for it all arose over the fact that the duke, having been divorced by one American wife, married another. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as excommunication in the Anglican Church. But what Bishop Burge has "pulled" on His Grace of Marlborough is so near to it that it makes no matter.

The duke, as Lord Lieutenant of Oxfordshire, is ex-officio a member of the Oxford Diocesan Conference. But the Bishop has debarred him from attendance on the ground that "he has not the full status of a communicant." What the Bishop means, though he did not explicitly say so, is that the duke, being a "divorced person" who has remarried, has ipso facto lost the full status of a communicant.

The Duke of Marlborough first married Consuelo, daughter of William K. Vanderbilt. She divorced him in 1920, after a separation of thirteen years. When the decree was made absolute the duchess married M. Jacques Balsan and the duke married Gladys Deacon, who had been his first wife's bridesmaid. The wedding of Mme. Balsan took place at the Savoy Chapel in London, but the duke had considerable difficulty in finding a clergyman to give the blessing of the Church to his marriage in Paris. Finally the ceremony was conducted by a Scottish pastor.

Bishop Puts a Slight Upon Duke He Warned

The action of Bishop Burge was made all the more impressive by the fact that, as Lord Lieutenant, the duke is the direct representative of the King's person, with a constitutional right to attend the conference as such. Bishop Burge seems to have taken his step quite gratuitously. He had a long private interview with the duke after his remarriage last year and then asked him not to avail himself of his right to attend the conference. The duke complied. This year there was no interview and no request was made to him, nor is there any reason to believe that the duke contemplated attendance. Bishop Burge, therefore, appears to have gone out of his way to put a public affront upon the duke.

Obviously the Duke of Marlborough could not leave the matter where it was. His first step was to cause his solicitors to issue to the press a letter stating that "he possesses the status of a communicant with the sanction of his parish priests, both in Oxfordshire and in London, and with the full knowledge of the proper ecclesiastical authority." He is understood to be contemplating taking legal action to clear up his position in face of the Bishop's challenge.

Whether the duke personally pursues the matter or not, the affair is generally felt here to have precipitated a crisis in the relations between Church and State on the question of divorce. That question boils down to this: Is a bishop, as an official of the Established Church, the right to prevent another official of the crown from doing something which the law distinctly says he can do? Or can a man who is lawfully married be treated as a pariah by the Church because of his marriage?

While the law of England says that the Duke of Marlborough is a lawfully married man, fit to hold any office in the state, the Bishop of Oxford, who is also a paid public servant, says that he is an open and unrepentant sinner who cannot be allowed to attend a gathering of county and cathedral clergy.

If the duke had simply been divorced he need not, according to Bishop Burge's own doctrine, have ceased to be a full Church member. It is his remarriage which constitutes the ecclesiastical crime. The effect of Bishop Burge's action is to raise issues which both in regard to divorce and to the conflict between the ecclesiastical rites and the law of the land.

Issue Raised in Form Which Cannot Be Ignored

This particular question hitherto has been brought forward only in certain parishes where the incumbent has refused the Sacrament to divorced parties and these cases have been obscure. The issue, however, has now been raised in a form in which it cannot be ignored.

The ecclesiastical position is based frankly upon a refusal to recognize the divorce laws of the land where they conflict with the views of the Church. Consequently a divorced person who marries again is considered to be living in sin, and, therefore, an unrepentant sinner who cannot be admitted to the Sacrament. Some clergy have applied this equally to the guilty and innocent party in a divorce action and have refused to remarry an innocent divorcee. The majority, however, will admit the right of the innocent to remarry.

Opponents of Bishop Burge's action hold that this distinction between the innocent and guilty party is a particularly absurd one, in view of the existing state of public opinion and of the divorce laws. In the present state of the law, which the bishops in the House of Lords have steadily protested against reform, a man is often compelled to pretend to commit a criminal offense in order to get himself divorced. It does not in reality follow that he has committed the offense at all.

Due to these conditions collusion and perjury — both serious offenses under the law — are notoriously rife and widespread in the English divorce court. Divorce judges recently have had hard things to say about it, but the existing tangle is conceded on all hands to put a premium on breaking one law as the sole means of getting relief under another.

The divorce situation in England was getting pretty well tied up without the flinging of the ecclesiastical gauntlet into the arena by Bishop Burge of Oxford. After this it looks as though something had to break some place. Lord Birkenhead, the ex-Lord Chancellor, a strong advocate of divorce law reform, has described the Bishop's action as "un-Christian as it was arrogant, and of doubtful legality." One thing the clash of views certainly will do and that is to strengthen the movement, as powerful already inside the Church as outside, for divorce between Church and State themselves.

Depression Put a Curb on More Radical Forms of Defiance Used by Workers

Echoes From Abroad

Life in Soviet Land

In an essay, "Russian: Too Much Russian," in Velhagen and Klasingsche Monatshefte, appear the following memoirs of the author, Rudolph Stratz, who belongs to a German family settled in Odessa:

"My father was, even as my grandfather, a merchant of the first guild and an hereditary honorary freemen of Odessa. So thieves naturally assumed there was much silver plate. Robbery. Disappearence. All right. Nichevo. But a few weeks later I saw my father very angry and uneasy. The silver had been found by the police and could be called for. 'A nice mess!' said my father. 'If I go to the police the dogs there will draw up a protocol. My name will get into the record. Every day I'll be called away from my business and summoned there! And I won't get the silver after all. It's better to pay 100 rubles at once for receiving from my claim, so as not to be bothered with the whole business.' And so he did.

"One of my brothers, in winter, started the long drive in a sledge, through marshy woods, on the ice-covered river from Petersburg to Archangel. Arrives safe and sound. Great hilarity at his arrival: 'Do you know, gospodin Stratz, that the fellow who drove you alone by night through the woods is the head of a widely ramified band of murderers?' My brother tackles the man in private. 'You good for nothing! Why did you not kill me?' The driver grins submissively: 'Once they killed and robbed a baron, a man of high rank, of St. Petersburg. What an annoyance! What troubles! Ever new commissions! Examinations! Arrests! No! Never again! Your highness may confidently drive back with me.' And my brother did so.

"In August, 1893, the cholera raged in Russia. I traveled from Reval to Riga. People died like flies, which seemed not at all to disturb the general peace of mind. In the rear of the wooden station lay bundles of clothes, covered with sheepskin coats; dead peasants. But in Riga, cholera? Is there such a thing? Here, at any rate, not! Here the cholera is prohibited! Reason, quarantine. At first the still necessary vessels had to leave the port! Then, a few days after, the head waiter of the Hotel de Commerce announced to me, radiant with joy: 'Starting from after to-morrow the Governor will permit cholera!'"

* * *

Memoirs of Alexander II

The journals of the late Princess Dolgorouki Yourievski, the second (morganatic) wife of Tsar Alexander II, which are about to be published simultaneously in Russian, English, French and German, contain many notes written to her daily by the Tsar during the last dozen years of his reign, and dealing more with interesting personalities than with politics or diplomacy. Among the personages of whom he wrote were Queen Victoria, Emperor Francis Joseph and, above all, Kaiser William I, whom he profoundly respected.

These journals are very interesting on account of the light they throw on Alexander II's own character. They reveal a rectitude and clearness of views which historians have not always credited to this sovereign. The criticisms of the grand dukes and the Russian court are severe. The best of his thoughts are given to his son, later Tsar Alexander III.

After 1878 the Emperor became more and more absorbed by the revolutionary spirit rising in Russia. He described the numerous attempts on his life, several among them being passed without public notice. He deemed the measures taken by the police to protect him inopportune and inefficacious.

The last pages of his diary were devoted to the constitution which he intended to give to his country. He expressed his conviction that it would save Russia from a bloody revolution. His diary closed a few days before his assassination.

* * *

Masterpieces Uncut

The most celebrated writers have not always been adequately appreciated by their contemporaries. Thus "Madame Bovary" brought Flaubert altogether 300 francs. Chateaubriand had been dissuaded from publishing his "Génie du Christanisme," and Dominique" of Eugene Fromentin passed on its first appearance entirely unnoticed.

In England Daniel deFoe could not find a publisher for his "Robinson Crusoe," while Thackeray in vain tried to publish his "aVnity Fair." All of which proves superabundantly that the judgments of contemporaries are not always infallible.

* * *

Progress—Always

The pessimists are wrong. Progress, at least material progress, despite the jolts and stops, in the end always advances.

There still existed a few years ago a country that did not know the electric telegraph. It was the mysterious land of Tibet. Now it is all changed. As in the most civilized countries Tibet now possesses its telegraph system. The first telegram containing the salute of the Grand Lama to the Viceroy of India has been transmitted.

The pessimists are wrong. Progress is not a vain word.

* * *

The Newly Rich Very Old

Can we still speak of the newly rich? He has ceased to be a curiosity. He is even no longer seen. In fact, says "Le Petit Parisien," he is no longer a novelty. Besides, has he ever been it? Nothing is less sure. Even the contrary is certain.

There has just been republished Dufresny's "Amusement serieux et comiques," a quite forgotten work, published in the time of Louis XIV, and in this can be read:

"This 'newly rich,' who spends money like water when it is a question of making a show, dazzles you by his magnificence; he even gives, and with good grace conceals the pain he feels, to give. 'Ah, the noble soul,' they cry. Alas! It's only by dint of baseness of soul that he made the money by which to appear so generous!"

If Dufresny would come back to the world, he would find nothing changed.

* * *

Mariquita, the Ballerina

Mariquita, the favorite and famous ballerina, whose death was recently announced, went through life ignorant of her parentage and of the date and place of her birth. Her early years were spent among roving gypsies, and she was passed from one band to another. The result was that when she grew old enough to take an interest in her origin and began to make inquiries about herself nobody could give her any information. And this circumstance was for the dancer a subject of profound sadness which she did not always succeed in dissimulating.

However, once Mariquita had a glimmer of hope. She was driving in a wagon with two of her comrades through the surroundings of Algiers. Suddenly she rose, with wide open eyes, staring:

"This road," she cried with much emotion, "I recognize it. Five meters from here is a white house whither they go to pray; then, further on, is a village which is girdled by a river."

It was found that Mariquita had not been mistaken. The white house, a small mosque, and the village were exactly as she had told. But the inhabitants of the village could not remember Mariquita.

"I swear to you, all the same, that I was born there and made there my first steps!" declared the ballerina.

And no one doubted it.

Heart of London Is Shrinking Dwellers Migrate to 'Outer Ring'

LONDON, November 8.

FOR the last twenty years the population of the County of London has been gradually getting smaller, until now there are more than 50,000 fewer people in the county than there were in 1901. On the other hand, the number of people living in the outer ring, or London outside the county area, has increased by nearly a million. At midnight, June 19, 1921, the total population of London, including its outer ring, was 7,480,201; in 1901 the figures were 6,591,402.

The British Isles as a whole, have 2,000,000 more women than men, and the city of London alone contributes a quarter of this figure. In 1921 the excess of women over men in London and her suburbs was 552,160. The ten years from 1911 to 1921 saw the male population increase by only 57,603, while the number of women gained from 3,844,940 to well over four millions, making an increase of 171,240, or three times the total increase of men. For this, however, the war years 1914-'18 are mainly responsible.

During these years there was also a great increase in the number of widows, the number going from 197,693 in 1911 to 223,615 in 1921. Of the total population of the county in this year, 1,131,889 men were single, 865,300 married, 72,459 widowed and 1,931 divorced, and of the women, 1,309,828 were single, 877,298 married, 223,615 widowed and 2,203 divorced. While the number of spinsters between twenty and thirty years old has decreased in the last few years, there has been a very large increase in their number above the ages of thirty-nine. It has been suggested that this decrease in young and middle-aged single women is probably due to emigration.

The census returns give an interesting table which shows the number of voters in the various boroughs. Men in England are allowed to vote as soon as they reach the age of twenty-one, but women must be thirty years old before they can qualify for franchise. If Englishwomen were given the vote at the same age as the men they would preponderate in most of the London boroughs and could control every election. As it is, for the whole of the County of London the number of women voters in 1921 was only 938,326, while the men numbered 1,170,662.

As the result of marriages after the war, there has been a considerable increase in the number of children in London, and the total of one year and under is the largest on record, 97,368 boys and 94,787 girls.

The average size of a private family in the city has decreased from 4.15 to 3.79 since 1911. The housing tables of the Census Blue Book show that there has been a tremendous shrinkage in the number of families living in houses containing six rooms and over. The "new poor" have been obliged to accept smaller dwellings and where 4.1 per cent of the private families in 1911 occupied places with ten rooms and over, in 1921 only 1.9 per cent lived in these larger houses. This means that the greater majority of new houses built in these years contained under six rooms. In spite of smaller houses, however, the average amount of accommodation per person has increased during the last ten years, the average numbr of rooms occupied per head in 1911 being .87 and in 1921 .91.

Husbands, it has been discovered, are invariably from two to three years older than their wives, and as the result of the changes in population the average age of the inhabitants of London has increased. At the census of 1911 twenty centenarians were returned, while in 1921 this number had increased to thirty-two, thirteen of these being in the county itself. It is reckoned that the average age of Londoners has increased by two years in the last ten years.